



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/630,010	07/30/2003	Yoshihiro Oda	FUJI 20.527	8533

26304 7590 11/13/2006

KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP  
575 MADISON AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER
----------

NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 11/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/630,010	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ODA, YOSHIHIRO	
	<b>Examiner</b> Minh Dieu Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/30/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

1. The information disclosure statement filed 7/30/2003 has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

### ***Specification***

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

This claim recites "an authentication method ...comprising the steps of causing ... and allowing ...". The claimed language does not have a tangible result recited, "allowing" does not actually do something, there is no physical result. "Accessing" is a physical action. The claim however does not recite accessing, as such, it fails to fall within a statutory category.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miller et al. (US 2003/0105981).

a) As to claim 1, Miller discloses an authentication method for using a plurality of Web servers to allow only a user in a certain group to access information in said Web servers, wherein a first Web server in said Web servers has a restricted access domain that only the user in said certain group is allowed to access from a client terminal and does not have authentication information regarding the user, and a second Web server in said Web servers has the restricted access domain (i.e. protected resources, see Miller paragraph 0023) that only the user in said certain group is allowed to access and further has said authentication information registered thereto (i.e. authentication for access control of protected resources and the use of authentication granted by one system as a basis for granting authentication on another system, see Miller paragraph 0003), comprising the steps of:

causing said first Web server (e.g. system 1, see Miller Fig. 1, element 102) to request authentication (see Miller paragraph 0045) from said second Web server (e.g. system 2, see Miller Fig. 1, element 104); and

allowing said user to access said restricted access domain in said first Web server from said client terminal based on an authentication result provided to said first Web server by said second Web server (see Miller paragraph 0048).

b) As to claim 6, Miller discloses an authentication apparatus for allowing only a user in a certain group to access information in a restricted access domain therein (i.e. an authentication method and system for access control of protected resources, see Miller paragraphs 0003, 0023) comprising:

an authentication requested Web server registering part registering a Web server as an authentication requested Web server (e.g. system 2, see Miller Fig. 1, element 104), said Web server having a same restricted access domain as said restricted access domain therein (e.g. protected resources, see Miller paragraph 0023) and further having authentication information regarding the user registered thereto (e.g. client registers with system 2, see Miller paragraphs 0055-0058; Fig. 3, element 306-310); and

an authentication requesting part (e.g. system 1, see Miller Fig. 1, element 102) requesting authentication from said Web server (see Miller paragraph 0045) with reference to said authentication requested Web server registering part when said authentication requesting part receives an access request (see Miller Fig. 2, element

202) for access to said restricted access domain therein from a client terminal of the user,

wherein said Web server determines whether or not said authentication is valid (see Miller Fig. 2, element 214) and said access request is allowed based on an authentication result determined by said Web server (see Miller paragraph 0048).

7. Claims 1-3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Stewart (US 2004/0010714).

a) As to claim 1, Stewart discloses an authentication method for using a plurality of Web servers to allow only a user in a certain group to access information in said Web servers, wherein a first Web server in said Web servers has a restricted access domain that only the user in said certain group is allowed to access from a client terminal and does not have authentication information regarding the user, and a second Web server in said Web servers has the restricted access domain (i.e. protected resources/URL, see Stewart paragraph 0029) that only the user in said certain group is allowed to access and further has said authentication information registered thereto (i.e. authentication for access control of protected resources and the use of authentication granted by one system as a basis for granting authentication on another system, see Stewart paragraph 0008), comprising the steps of:

causing said first Web server (e.g. FTP server and associated FTP authentication module, see Stewart, Fig. 4, elements 412 and 413) to request authentication (i.e. transmitting request for access to a protected resource, see Stewart

paragraph 0029; Fig. 5, element 520) from said second Web server (e.g. Web server, see Stewart Fig. 4, element 414); and

allowing said user to access said restricted access domain in said first Web server from said client terminal based on an authentication result provided to said first Web server by said second Web server (see Stewart paragraph 0029).

b) As to claim 2, Stewart discloses the first Web server delivers an authentication information request received from said second Web server to said client terminal (i.e. Web server sends a response to the FTP authentication module requesting the user's credentials, see Stewart paragraph 0028) and then delivers authentication information received from said client terminal for said authentication information request to said second Web server (i.e. the FTP authentication module provide the Web server with the user's credentials by asking the user to provide credentials, see Stewart paragraph 0028).

c) As to claim 3, Stewart discloses the second Web server (e.g. network based authentication service, see Stewart Fig. 3, element 318) receives an authentication request (see Stewart paragraph 0024) from a plurality of first Web servers (e.g. FTP server and Web server, see Stewart Fig. 3, elements 312 and 314).

d) As to claim 5, Stewart discloses the first Web server (e.g. FTP server, see Stewart Fig. 4, element 412) delivers an authentication request (e.g. request with username and password, see Stewart paragraph 0026) to another first Web server (e.g. Web server, see Stewart Fig. 4, element 414) and said other first Web server delivers

the authentication request to said second Web server (e.g. network based authentication service, see Stewart Fig. 4, element 418).

e) As to claim 6, Stewart discloses an authentication apparatus for allowing only a user in a certain group to access information in a restricted access domain therein (i.e. an authentication method and system for access control of protected resources, see Stewart paragraph 0029) comprising:

an authentication requested Web server registering part registering a Web server as an authentication requested Web server (e.g. Web server, see Stewart Fig. 4, element 414), said Web server having a same restricted access domain as said restricted access domain therein (e.g. protected resources/URL, see Stewart paragraph 0029) and further having authentication information regarding the user registered thereto (e.g. user's credentials in local user database, see Stewart paragraph 0030);  
and

an authentication requesting part (e.g. FTP server and associated FTP authentication module, see Stewart, Fig. 4, elements 412 and 413) requesting authentication from said Web server (i.e. transmitting request for access to a protected resource, see Stewart paragraph 0029; Fig. 5, element 520) with reference to said authentication requested Web server registering part when said authentication requesting part receives an access request (see Stewart, Fig. 5, element 510) for access to said restricted access domain therein from a client terminal of the user,



wherein said Web server determines whether or not said authentication is valid and said access request is allowed based on an authentication result determined by said Web server (see Stewart paragraph 0029; Fig. 5, elements 525, 530, 535, 540).

f) As to claim 7, Stewart discloses said authentication requesting part delivers an authentication information request received from said Web server to said client terminal (i.e. Web server sends a response to the FTP authentication module requesting the user's credentials, see Stewart paragraph 0028) and delivers authentication information supplied in response to said authentication information request by said client terminal to said Web server (i.e. the FTP authentication module provide the Web server with the user's credentials by asking the user to provide credentials, see Stewart paragraph 0028).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject-matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in view of Stewart (US 2004/0010714) in view of Gray (2002/0188738).

Stewart discloses the authentication method as claimed in claim 1, however he is silent on the capability of having the first Web server delivers an authentication request to a plurality of second Web servers. Gray is relied on for the teaching of the first Web

Art Unit: 2137

server (e.g. proxy server, see Gray Fig. 4, element 24) delivers an authentication request to a plurality of second Web servers (e.g. authentication servers A, B, C see Gray Fig. 4, elements 30-34; paragraph 0046). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of the first Web server delivers an authentication request to a plurality of second Web servers in the system of Miller, as Gray teaches, so as to properly and effectively handle access request from client (see Gray paragraph 0047).

### ***Conclusion***

The prior arts made of record and not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3873.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Application/Control Number: 10/630,010

Page 10

Art Unit: 2137

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mdn

11/9/06

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Nguyenbmdm", is written over the typed name "mdn".